REMARKS

Claims 40-95 are pending in the application, with claims 40, 47, 55, 66, 73, 81 and 89 being independent. Claims 40, 41, 47, 49 and 55 have been amended and new claims 66-95 have been added. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 15, lines 13-16, and page 18, line 23 to page 19, line 4. In addition, the new claims are all believed to find support in Fig. 1 and Embodiment Mode 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 40-65 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Forrest (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,360) in view of Arai (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,272).

With respect to claim 40 and its dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Forrest, Arai, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests applying one of predetermined two voltages to the gate electrode of a transistor that is electrically connected to an electroluminescent element that employs triplet excitation, and because there would have been no motivation to combine Forrest and Arai in the manner set forth in the rejection. Applying one of predetermined two voltages to the gate electrode of a transistor (i.e., digitally driving the transistor) allows for a reduction in the operating voltage of the EL element relative to an EL element that is driven in an analog manner.

The rejection appears to assert that applying one of predetermined two voltages to the gate electrode of a transistor (i.e., digitally driving the transistor) would be inherent in Arai's system. While applicant agrees that different voltages must be applied to the gate electrode of a transistor to turn the transistor on or off, this does not mean that the transistor must be digitally driven. For example, the transistor may be driven in an analog manner by applying a variety of voltages that exceed or fall below the threshold voltage of the transistor in order to control the operating state of the transistor.

Indeed, just such an analog arrangement is shown in Fig. 6 of Arai, where the gate of a current control transistor 605 that is connected to an organic EL element 606 is connected to Vdd through a capacitor 607 and is also connected to the drain of a transistor 604 that has its source connected to a line 601 on which a picture signal is provided. In this arrangement, a variety of

analog voltages, rather than just one of two predetermined voltages, will be provided to the gate of the current control transistor 605.

Moreover, while the rejection appears to assert that it would have been obvious to combine Forrest and Arai in order to control the currents applied to the electroluminescent element because Arai suggests "a thin film transistor for controlling current supplied to the EL element," applicant disagrees that Arai's description of techniques for controlling EL element that do not include electroluminescence from triplet excitation would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to control an EL element that includes electroluminescence from triplet excitation in the same manner.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 40 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Like claim 40, each of independent claims 47 and 55, and new independent claims 66, 73, 81 and 89, recites applying one of predetermined two voltages to the gate electrode of a transistor that is electrically connected to an electroluminescent element. Accordingly, each of these claims is believed to be allowable over Forrest and Arai for at least the reasons presented above.

Enclosed is a $3540 check for a Request for Continued Examination fee ($790), for excess claim fees ($2300) and for the Petition for Extension of Time fee ($450). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/20/05

John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331